

Action Item

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Approval of the Minutes of the April 2-3, 2001, Meeting

MINUTES

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Meeting of April 2-3, 2001

**Commissioners
present
April 2, 2001**

Alan S. Arkatov *Chair*
Carol Chandler, *Vice Chair*
Phillip J. Forhan
Robert Hanff
Lance Izumi
Kyo "Paul" Jhin
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Peter Preuss
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.,
Evonne Seron Schulze
Olivia K. Singh
Howard Welinsky

**Commissioners
absent**

John G. Davies
Susan Hammer
Kyhl Smeby
Melinda G. Wilson

**Commissioners
present
April 3, 2001**

Alan S. Arkatov, *Chair*
Carol Chandler, *Vice Chair*
Phillip J. Forhan
Robert Hanff
Lance Izumi
Kyo "Paul" Jhin
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Peter Preuss
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.
Evonne Seron Schulze
Olivia K. Singh
Howard Welinsky
Melinda G. Wilson

**Commissioners
absent**

John G. Davies
Susan Hammer
Kyhl Smeby

Call to order Commission Chair Arkatov called the Monday, April 2, 2001 meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission to order at 1:11 p.m. in the University of California at Davis Recreation Pool Lodge, One Shields Avenue, Davis, California. He asked for a call of the roll.

Call of the roll Staff member Judy Harder called the roll and all commissioners except Davies, Hammer, Smeby and Wilson were present before the call of the roll.

Approval of the minutes	A motion was made to adopt the minutes of the Commission meeting of February 4 and 5, 2001. It was moved, seconded and approved without dissent to adopt the minutes. Commissioner Schultz recommended that one typographical error be corrected for the record.
Introduction of new commissioners	Chair Arkatov introduced and Executive Director Fox welcomed two new Commissioners, Olivia K. Singh and Peter Preuss.
Report of the Chair	<p>Chair Arkatov asked Gerald C. Hayward introduce a discussion with Aims McGuinness and Dennis Jones of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. Mr. Hayward explained that the presentation is part of the Commission's ongoing commitment to a serious review of its role and effectiveness. He said that the objective is to more clearly define the Commission's place in higher education in California as well as to improve its effectiveness on a number of dimensions. He reported that the Commission has contracted with Management Analysis and Planning and with NCHEMS to assist in this important endeavor. Mr. Hayward reported that he had completed some 50 interviews that are part of a full report that would be given to the Commission at the June meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Hayward stated that the day's agenda grew out of recognition by the Commissioners that there was not a consensus among them about the appropriate role of the Commission, and that a useful and necessary step to improve the Commission's effectiveness was a thoughtful review of its role. He stated that the commissioners have contracted with NCHEMS, and more specifically Dennis Jones and Aims McGuinness, to assist in this work.</p> <p>Mr. McGuinness started his presentation off with an outline on what was to be covered and emphasized that it was Chair Arkatov's intention that this be an interactive session. He discussed the State's coordination of higher education and the coordination across the country from a historical point of view. The difference between coordination and governance was stressed as a key point. Emphasis was placed on orderly development, curbing unnecessary duplication and countering turf battles. Typical functions such as planning, policy analysis, problem resolution, academic program review and approval, roles in budget development, information systems and accountability were addressed. Other traditional functions mentioned included administering programs, special projects, and administration of student financial assistance and responsibility for licensure and authorization of institutions.</p> <p>Mr. McGuinness made a clear distinction between coordinating boards and governing boards and said across the country a confusion of those terms is probably the most important contributor to the failure of governance. He pointed out the differences between the authority and functions of these two types of boards and explained that coordinating boards focus on State priorities and do not govern institutions and that most coordinating boards are in states with strong traditions of decentralized system and institutional governance. The issue of formal authority, and whether influence depends</p>

far less on formal authority than on reputation for objectivity, fairness, and timeliness of analysis and advice, was raised. He said there should be the capacity to gain the trust and respect of not simply the political leaders or the institutional leaders, but of both. Institutional and system leaders who recognize and support effective coordination to address State policy issues were discussed.

Mr. McGuinness presented a list of points regarding coordination in transition. He stressed moving from:

- ♦ Rational planning to strategic planning.
- ♦ Established Universities to new providers.
- ♦ A focus on providers to a focus on stakeholders.
- ♦ A focus on issues internal to higher education to focus on higher education's contribution to State priorities.
- ♦ A focus on higher education to focus on primary kindergarten through 20.
- ♦ Service areas defined by geographic boundaries to responsibility areas defined by needs of clients.
- ♦ Centralized control to decentralized management.
- ♦ Policies that limit competition to policies to "enter the Market" on behalf of the public and channel competitive forces toward public purposes.
- ♦ The use of public agencies and institutions to the use of non-governmental entities.

Mr. McGuinness presented a detailed structure of desirable attributes and focus points that facilitate effective coordinating boards. Mr. Dennis Jones presented key processes in creating a public agenda. These included the following:

- ♦ Using information to create a public agenda for change.
- ♦ Reviewing the match or mismatch between the delivery capacity of the State versus the priorities defined in the public agenda.
- ♦ Reviewing existing policy for incentives and disincentives.
- ♦ Aligning policy with the public agenda.

Mr. Jones summarized financial strategies, which included linking financing policy, and the public agenda, flow of funds, budget components and changing philosophy in State funding. Mr. McGuinness provided details on some strategies for change, among them were:

- ♦ Advocacy for the needs of the population and economy.
- ♦ Developing and sustaining attention to a limited number of goals for measurable improvement.

- ♦ Linking financing to the public agenda.
- ♦ Reforming all the basic policy tools.
- ♦ Decentralizing governance balanced by centralized policy leadership in the public interest and the use of Compacts.
- ♦ Use of non-governmental organizations.

Mr. McGuinness stated that his organization conducted a survey of initiatives across the country last year and summarized several observations that included:

- ♦ Most states tend to be focused on institutions and providers.
- ♦ There are major differences among states in the continuity of reform.
- ♦ Pressure for reform has lessened due to a strong economy.

In conclusion, Mr. McGuinness noted that fundamental changes are occurring in the role of government in advancing long-term improvement in higher education. There is a developing sense of “best practice,” and the capacity of government to change is seriously lagging behind the pace of change. He said countries around the world recognize the need to change the way they function relative to higher education and the U.S. needs to pay attention to those reforms elsewhere.

Recess Chair Arkatov recessed the meeting at 2:55 p.m. for a break.

Reconvene Chair Arkatov reconvened the Commission meeting at 3:06 p.m. He introduced Sam Swofford, Executive Director of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Mr. Swofford’s presentation on teacher quality in elementary and secondary education included the following highlights:

- ♦ Studies indicate that an effective teacher is the most influential factor in student achievement.
- ♦ California will need to train and higher 300,000 new teachers over the next decade.
- ♦ A standards-based performance assessment that all teachers would be required to pass is in its 2nd year of development by the Commission.

The U.S. Department of Education has approved -A plan for institutional “report cards” and the data elements within them.

- ♦ Future reports will contain the pass rate from the teacher performance assessment. From this data the Commission will develop a State report to be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education by October 7, 2001.
- ♦ In addition to the Title II grant projects implementation and reporting requirements; the Commission has been working on implementation of the credentialing bill of 1998 SB 2042.

- ♦ The Commission has developed a set of Draft Standards for teacher preparation that is under field review.
- ♦ Validity studies that have been done in respect to exams have protected the agency as well as the integrity of the Commission's programs from undue litigation.
- ♦ Building a standards-based induction program into the credential architecture will ensure that new teachers will have the guidance and support they need in the formative years of their teaching career.

Chair Arkatov asked Mr. Swofford to go a little deeper into the quality of the "Report card". Mr. Swofford responded with details of the content standards and validity studies on teacher exams. Commissioner Pesqueira stated that a large number of teachers will have to come from out of State and inquired how this could be accomplished. Mr. Swofford responded that there is not much incentive for other states to encourage teachers to come to California and that is why California has recruitment centers and internship programs which will go a long way to address this issue.

Dr. Swofford discussed teacher preparation programs, features of the CBEST test, and requirements for entering California as an out of state teacher.

**Report of the
Statutory Advisory
Committee**

Christopher Cabaldon, Chair of the Statutory Advisory Committee, reported on the advisory committee meeting of March 27, 2001. He stated that the Committee would like to encourage careful consideration of the relationship between joint use proposals for facilities and the Commission's objective review process for facility proposals. Among the issues discussed were:

- ♦ Growing legislative interest in the selection procedures for community college presidents.
- ♦ Standard Achievement Test (SATI)
- ♦ Results in the Partnership for Excellence for the community colleges.
- ♦ The independent colleges reported that they are moving towards an on-line articulation agreement system.
- ♦ New presidents at Channel Islands.

Recess

Chair Arkatov recessed the Commission meeting at 3:49 p.m. in order to convene the Education Policy and Programs Committee.

Reconvene/Recess

Chair Arkatov reconvened the Commission meeting at 5:33 p.m. and recessed until the following day at 8:30 a.m.

**Reconvene,
April 3, 2001**

Chair Arkatov called the Tuesday April 3, 2001 meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission to order at 8:36 a.m. at the University of California Davis,

Recreation Pool Lodge, One Shields Ave. Davis, California 95616. He asked for a call of the roll.

Call of the roll	Judy Harder called the roll and all Commissioners were present except Davies, Hammer, and Smeby.
-------------------------	--

Master plan status report	<p>Commissioner Schulze introduced Senator Dede Alpert who made a presentation about the progress of the Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education. Senator Alpert stated that the plan is based on best practices and on research. She reflected upon the history of the original Master Plan and the factors involved in the concept that the original Master Plan needed to change. An explanation regarding the processes and participants involved in determining the focus of the new Master Plan followed. Early Joint Committee activities, which included holding “Town Halls”, regional symposia of education leaders, interviews and research, were described as leading to the development of a framework to guide future activities of the Master Plan process. The Senator described the composition of the Master Plan Joint Committee and 7 Master Plan working groups. She stated that the Working Groups would work throughout this year and come back to the Joint Committee with recommendations. Some of the issues these Working groups will be looking at were discussed and are as follows:</p>
----------------------------------	--

- ◆ Student learning and remediation.
- ◆ Fostering access, opportunity and success for every child in California.
- ◆ Articulating and aligning curriculum and assessments.
- ◆ Remedial instruction and University eligibility.
- ◆ Governance.
- ◆ Coordination of Public education system governance bodies.
- ◆ How to set up a system that is accountable.
- ◆ Simplification of Education finance issues.
- ◆ Adequate levels of funding.
- ◆ Revenue raising options on a local level.
- ◆ Teacher, Faculty and Administrator preparations, supply and distribution issues, and quality of preparation.
- ◆ Essential educational needs of the California economy.
- ◆ Alignment of career and technical education with academic standards.
- ◆ Uses of technology in learning, including distance education.
- ◆ Alternatives in delivery and design of instruction.
- ◆ Adult education

♦ Data Information Systems

Senator Alpert described the Master Plan development process that included; Fact-finding, research, and analysis through the Working Groups and solicitation of public comment, expert advice and testimony. She estimated that the Master Plan deliberations should begin in January 2002 whereupon the Master Plan document would begin to be written and hopefully completed by August 2002. In conclusion Senator Alpert encouraged everyone to visit the Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education website

(<http://www.sen.ca.gov/masterplan>) which maintains comprehensive information on the hearings, working groups, documents and issues.

Recess	Chair Arkatov recessed the meeting at 9:28 a.m. in order to convene the Governmental Relations Committee.
---------------	---

Reconvene	Chair Arkatov reconvened the Commission meeting at 9:40 a.m. He called upon Director Fox for his report.
------------------	--

Report of the Executive Director	Director Fox reported that he and Senator Alpert had met and spoken with Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education representatives about holding a conference in California around teacher education. He said that WICHE and the Ford Foundation will sponsor a meeting on May 10, 2001 in Sacramento and will host a meeting at CPEC on April 23, 2001 for all student leaders who are members of boards of the Regents, Trustees and CPEC.
---	---

Director Fox discussed tab 3. He noted that the agenda item on the Financial Condition of Independent Colleges and Universities (Tab 14) had been postponed.

Recess	Chair Arkatov recessed the Commission at 10:22 a.m. in order to convene the Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee.
---------------	---

Reconvene	Chair Arkatov reconvened the meeting at 10:31 a.m.
------------------	--

Report of the Educational Policy and Programs Committee	Commissioner Pesqueira reported that the Educational Policy and Programs Committee met the day before and had two action items that he moved for full Commission vote. It was seconded and approved unanimously by the Commission.
--	--

Report of the Governmental Relations Committee	Committee Chair Welinsky reported that the Committee met and took positions on 39 pieces of legislation and offered the report and a motion for approval. The motion was seconded and adopted without dissent.
---	--

Report of the Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee	Committee Chair Lance Izumi reported that the committee adopted the report entitled Faculty Salaries in California Public Universities 2001-2002 and he moved to have it adopted by the full Commission. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously to adopt the Committee's report.
---	--

Other business	Chair Arkatov invited each of the Faculty Senate heads from Community Colleges, CSU's, UC's, and Independents to come to CPEC to work on their agenda and issues with staff. Commissioner Fox suggested that the Commission work with the Statutory Advisory Committee to get an appropriate forum and feedback on the issues. Additionally, Chair Arkatov stated that there would be a Commission meeting in June in Sacramento, and that the meeting scheduled for the end of July would be in San Jose.
-----------------------	--

Adjournment	Having no further business, Chair Arkatov adjourned the meeting at 10:54 a.m.
--------------------	---
